



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/531,571 | 04/18/2005 | Toshio Yoshizawa | 087429 | 2324 |
| 23373 | 7590 | 06/01/2006 | EXAMINER | |
| SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037 | | | GRAFFEO, MICHEL | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1614 | |

DATE MAILED: 06/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 10/531,571 | YOSHIZAWA ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Michel Graffeo | 1614 |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 4 and 7-9 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) 4 and 7-9 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

| | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claim 4, drawn to a pharmaceutical composition comprising a compound having the general structure as shown in formula I, classified in class 514, subclass 579.
- II. Claims 7-9, drawn to a method of treating COPD, classified in class 514, subclass 740.

Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the product can be used for the treatment of rheumatoid diseases (see WO 99/19296).

Accordingly, Applicant is required to make an election of one of the Groups above and further, in addition, Applicant is required to make an election of one species therein as discussed below.

The practice, re: Markush claims encompassing multiple independent and patentably distinct inventions is set for the in M.P.E.P. 803. The following requirement

to make a provisional election of a single independent and patentably distinct invention is made pursuant to said practice.

Claim 4, Group I, is drawn in Markush format encompass multiple and patentably distinct inventions. The claims are drawn to a composition or treatment which comprises the compound of formula I and a compound that is part of independently distinct classes of compounds listed as patentably distinct inventions:

Invention 1: anticholinergic agents

Invention 2: beta 2 stimulators

Invention 3: theophylline products

Invention 4: leukotriene receptor antagonists

Invention 5: tromboxane synthetase inhibitors

Invention 6: thromboxane A2 receptor antagonists

Invention 7: mediator release inhibitors

Invention 8: antihistamic agents

Invention 9: xanthine derivative

Invention 10: cytokine inhibitors

Invention 11: prostaglandins

Invention 12: forskolin

Invention 13: PDE inhibitor

Invention 14: elastase inhibitor

Invention 15: aerosol steroid

Invention 16: expectorant

Invention 17: antibacterial agent

The groups above are set forth in order of precedence in the claims. Any specie/compound/composition having the distinguishing feature set forth in one of the above groups will be contained in that group regardless of the fact that it may also contain a feature set forth in a group of lower precedence.

It is considered that at Markush type claim encompassing such species is directed to multiple independent and patentably distinct inventions since the species are so unrelated and diverse that a prior art reference anticipating the claims with respect to one of the species will not render the claim anticipated or obvious under 35 U.S.C. 102 nor 35 U.S.C. 103 respectively with regard to any one other of the species. Further these species are considered to be independent since they are unconnected in operation, one does not require the others for ultimate use and the specification does not disclose a dependent relationship between them. Moreover, each of the stated species is considered patentably distinct from the others on the basis of its properties. Thus, the stated species are capable of supporting separate patents under 35 U.S.C. 121.

Accordingly, applicants are required to make a provisional election of a single independent and /or patentably distinct Invention stated *supra* from the list of patentably distinct Inventions prior to an examination of said species on the merits. This election will be given effect in the event the Markush type claims are not found allowable, at

which time the examination of the claims presented will be limited to the Markush type claims and claims directed solely to the elected species. The claims directed solely to the nonelected species will be held withdrawn from further consideration. It should be noted that an election of species has been held to be tantamount to a requirement for restriction (see *In re Herrick*, 1958 CD 1, and *In re Joyce* 1958 CD2).

Applicant's response must include a provisional election of one of the independent and patentably distinct inventions identified above even though the requirement is traversed (37 C.F.R. 1.142 and 1.143). Applicant is advised that any traverse must be supported by argument in order to perfect the right to petition in the event that the provisional requirement is given effect in the event noted above.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 30 days from the date of this letter.

The following specie election is required also regarding the election of either of Groups I or II, Applicant is additionally required to elect a species of compound of the elected Invention for search purposes. A specific compound must be elected for example salbutamol, and not a generic class. In other words, Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Additionally, Applicant is required elect a species of compound of formula I and to define each of R¹ and R² and any additional variables as required for a particular species. Currently, claims 4 and 7 are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Rejoinder Notice

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

All claims directed a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Election/Restrictions Proper

MPEP §809.02(d) states “[w]here only generic claims are presented, no restriction can be required except in those applications where the generic claims recite such a multiplicity of species that an unduly extensive and burdensome search is necessary.”. Here, the claims recited such a multiplicity of species that an unduly

extensive and burdensome search would be necessary if all of the claimed species were to be examined simultaneously.

The present claims are directed to a method of treating respiratory complaints. Present claim 1 for example provides a variety of possibilities for R¹ and R² which can be variable length alkyl chains with a number of substitutions. For hypothetical exemplification purposes only, if each of the variables above were each limited to 10 possible moieties there would be 10² possible species of compounds to be searched.

Further, as shown by the following classifications, a majority of the combinations encompassed by the present claims has acquired a separate status in the art. For example, if the second agent in claim 4 contains a 7 membered ring containing one N it is classified in class 514 subclass 212.01 whereas if the second agent in claim 4 contains R³ and R⁴ together form a 6 membered ring containing one N it is classified in class 514 subclass 222.2. Notwithstanding that the classification of some of the active agents is co-extensive, all of the claimed compounds are patently distinct and fully capable of supporting separate patents.

For the above reasons, an election of a single disclosed species for examination purposes is deemed necessary and proper.

Inventorship Notice

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim

remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michel Graffeo whose telephone number is 571-272-8505. The examiner can normally be reached on 9am to 5:30pm Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin Marschel can be reached on 571-272-0718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

14 May 2006
MG

Ardin H. Marschel 5/29/06
ARDIN H. MARSCHEL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER